

## **Remarks**

In response to the foregoing amendments and following remarks responsive to the Final Office Action dated June 30, 2006, applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application.

No claims have been rejected based on prior art grounds.

Applicant respectively thanks the Office for the indication that claims 13-17, 20, 21, 31, 32, and 34 are allowed and that claims 1, 12, 27, 29, and 35-37 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, set forth in the final Office Action. Since the remaining claims not mentioned in the two preceding paragraphs depend from one or more of the claims mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, it is apparent that all pending claims will be allowable if the claims are amended to overcome the objections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Office rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 19, 23, 25-27, 29, and 35-37 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office stated that claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 23, and 25-26 are rejected because of the rejected base claim.

With respect to claims 1 and 12, the Office asserted that "said first device" and "said second device" lack clear antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12 to refer back properly to the "target" and "control" devices, rather than "first" and "second" devices.

With respect to claim 19, the Office asserted that "said other device" lacks clear antecedent basis. While Applicant respectfully disagrees, Applicant has herein amended claim 19 to refer to "said another device" in order to provide more literal antecedent basis.

With respect to claim 27, the Office asserted that "said second device" lacks clear antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 27 to refer back to the "control" device recited in claim 12.

Applicant has herein cancelled claim 29, thus rendering the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, moot.

With respect to claim 25, the Office asserted that "said digital communication" lacks clear antecedent basis. Applicant has herein replaced that phrase with "said data", which has antecedent basis.

Finally, the Office asserted that, in claims 36 and 37, "said other device" lacks clear antecedent basis. Applicant has herein replaced "said other device" with "said transmitting device", which has clear antecedent basis.

Accordingly, all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, should now be cured or withdrawn.

Since the Office did not assert any other rejections of the claims, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned counsel by telephone call in order to further the prosecution of this case in any way.

Respectfully submitted,

September 21, 2006

Date

/Theodore Naccarella/

Theodore Naccarella  
Registration No. 33,023  
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP  
2600 Aramark Tower  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
Telephone: (215) 923-4466  
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189

TXN:pmf